

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No. 053451
Application No. 10/560,033

REMARKS

Claims 7-10 are pending in the present application. Claim 7 is herein amended. Claims 1-6 and 11-14 are herein canceled. No new matter has been presented.

Support for the amendment to claim 7 is in the specification at, *e.g.*, page 18, lines 6-8 and page 28, lines 18-24.

Claim Objection

Claim 6 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). Claim 6 has been cancelled. Withdrawal of the claim objection is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satani** (US 2002/01924121) in view of **Ishige** (US 2002/0155277), **Arjunan** (WO 98/44043), **Ikeda** (US 6,214,476) and **Nojima** (US 2001/0038204); claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satani** in view of **Ishige**, **Arjunan**, **Ikeda** and **Nojima**, and in further view of **Tanaka** (US 5,695,838); and claims 11, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satani** in view of **Ishige**, **Arjunan**, **Ikeda** and **Nojima**, and in further view of **Hoffman** (US 4,416,714).

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest that “the overcoat layer is provided on the entire surface of the front-film layer except for the portion corresponding to the center overlapped portion” as recited in amended claim 7.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No. 053451
Application No. 10/560,033

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 6 and 7 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of copending Application No. 11/596,678 in view of Ikeda (US 6,214,476).

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither the claims of the '678 application nor Ikeda teach or suggest that "the overcoat layer is provided on the entire surface of the front-film layer except for the portion corresponding to the center overlapped portion" as recited in amended claim 7.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 7 is patentable over the cited references and claims 8-10 are patentable by virtue of their dependence from claim 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7-10 is hereby solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No. 053451
Application No. 10/560,033

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/Andrew G. Melick/

Andrew G. Melick
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,868
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

AGM/adp